An Operational Examination of the Community Living Service Delivery Model

Prepared by Fred Milowsky
September 30, 2004

Overview of Assignment

This paper summarizes my identification of operational issues for the Ministry of Children and Family Development and the Community Living BC Board, as requested in the August 15, 2004 Terms of Reference. Excerpts from the terms of reference include:

- To assess the operational validity of the assumptions and foundations of the proposed model
- To identify the operational requirements of the new model and the steps to be taken, to introduce the new model in the existing system
- To review the business flow chart for the new model
- To assess the model's ability to operate within ongoing fiscal constraints and to respond to demographics and waitlists
- To review with the CLBC Board and the Ministry the operational implications of implementing the new model

Approach:

My approach in assessing the conceptual service delivery model from an operational perspective was to gather as much information I could from the Ministry and from respondents about the workings of the model on a very operational, and day to day level. I did this through a series of interviews (detailed in Appendix 1) and through reading hundred of pages in documents outline in Appendix 2, which respondents identified as being helpful to this task. Included in these documents were detailed job descriptions of the various positions in the model. I was impressed with the amount of thinking, energy, vision and commitment that has gone into forming the conceptual vision and I certainly extend my appreciation to all the respondents who gave a significant amount of their time and cooperation to this interview process.

Approaching the task with a deep respect for the CLBC Vision, my terms of reference had me look primarily at operational issues, which the Board, the CEO and the Ministry might need to address before the implementation stage. If my

comments are challenging to the service delivery model, it is nonetheless, my honest attempt to assist CLBC to develop a model, which can better achieve the Vision.

Observations and Information From Respondents

In order to get a good picture of the service delivery model I had to go to a number of contract staff each of whom seemed to be focused on certain pieces of the whole. I read several documents that appeared to be in the possession of different contract staff, each document again focusing on a component of the model. I don't believe there was one central place where these documents were being stored. Nor was there a single Business Model document that outlined all the components and interactions of the service delivery model. **There needs to be such a document defining the service delivery model in very operational terms; including Roles, Responsibilities, Reporting Relationships, Linkages, Limitations on Authority.**

Vision: The Authority strives to pursue a vision of full inclusion of children and adults with developmental disabilities in their communities. The Authority's service delivery model is only one component of realizing the vision. Individuals, supported by family friends and a welcoming community is complemented by a CLBC service delivery model, which values and operationalizes choice, flexibility, and innovation. These are my words, based on what respondents told me. How this plays out in the service delivery model is in the various roles and responsibilities the model expects of family, friends and community, including the agency community. Some respondents, regarding the readiness of the community to take on these responsibilities, expressed a concern and skepticism. Parents told me how difficult it is to develop and sustain a non-paid support network around their son or daughter and of their battles with community to achieve inclusion. There is also a contrasting concern from others I spoke to, that if CLBC assumes the

responsibility and provides for the function, the community wouldn't. I agree there is a delicate balance- and that the vision is important to strive for and not lose sight of. However, operationally it is important for the Authority to ensure that important functions are provided, until such time that family, friends and community can assume the function, if that is the plan. I will be more specific about this issue later in the paper.

What people told me is Essential:

A consistent theme was the separation of planning from decision making and funding decisions. Everyone felt that facilitator needed to operate within a fiscal framework-although it was not clear how this was to be achieved. Facilitators did not have a budget; their plan would be submitted to an operations analyst in Vancouver, who had responsibility for both approving the plan and the funding level for the plan. The separation of planning from decision-making is central to the model and is done to accomplish the independent planning function of a facilitator. Yet, this same independent planning function poses a significant dilemma for the Authority—**How are facilitators to be given that fiscal framework in which to operate?** Without it, since overspending the budget is not option, the Authority can expect to receive complaints and appeals on the inconsistency between approved plans and the approved budget for the plans. **In addition to policy frameworks, funding formulas, unit costing, benchmarking, as operational solutions to this dilemma, building a working team relationship between the facilitator and operations analyst, I believe, is essential.** It is essential not only for the reasons stated above, but also because the two roles are interdependent and any conflict in how these people work together will be detrimental to the functioning of the organization. There are attempts in the model to facilitate teamwork. Operation analysts will have regional assignment and are expected to travel. Yet I don't think the model goes far enough in its facilitating this necessary collaboration **There needs to be a further exploration of how the model operationalizes the concepts of team and collaboration, including consideration of decentralizing some of the functions performed by the operations analyst to communities.**

Another reason stated for centralizing Operations, in addition to the independent planning function already mentioned and insufficient numbers of operation analysts in the model to decentralize, (which I shall address shortly), was a need to promote **consistency, equity and portability in the allocation of resources.** Consistency, equity and portability, are not characteristics of the current regionalized system. I agree that it is important to work towards this goal. I think it can be achieved with a combination of centralized policy development and Centralized Contract Management functions: including:

Procurement

Contract administration

Unit costing,

Benchmarking

IT Systems

The remaining functions can be decentralized to operation analysts in communities who work in partnership with facilitators in actualizing plans.

There is a need to explore models, which balance the objective of consistency and equity of Operations with the need for collaboration between staff that perform interdependent functions.

Another essential component of the vision was the **community development function** performed by the facilitator. They are not just involved in the planning for the individual, but also, in mobilizing the community around the individual and around people with a developmental disability in general. This is an important function, which, should not be performed in isolation of operations. By orchestrating in the model, the collaboration and team functioning of facilitators and analysts, this community development function can be strengthened.

Community Operations Analyst

As already pointed out, the title of this position is a misnomer given the centralization staff, budget and decision making in Vancouver. I have looked at Bylaw # 3 which will move the governance model more toward local participation. It will not be long before local bodies are asking for more local responsibility over budgets and decision-making.

Reviewing the job description of the operations analyst identifies many duties that require local community involvement as follows:

> " Work collaboratively with Panning and Community Development staff and service providers. (note collaboration is particularly required when crisis or conflict situations arise for individuals or families.)"
>
> " Meets and liaises with service providers via scheduled visits to review contract terms, financial reports and monitor outcomes and service level requirements"
>
> "Works with individuals and/ or families, Facilitators and service providers to individualize block funded contracts where there is an interest."
>
> "Engages the service provider in dialogue to understand their perspective on the issues and to develop a plan for change if areas of concern are noted"
>
> "Takes steps to resolve the issue or end the contract where quality or suitability of service do not meet requirements."
>
> "Ensures that a review or investigation takes place to resolve the situation when crises arise or questions of service quality affecting the care and safety of an individual (including those without a personal network) are made"

"Convenes a meeting with in individuals and or families, service providers, community partners, and a Facilitator, if one is involved, to plan an appropriate response.

"Monitors the outcome of the investigation……..and ensures that individuals/family have agreed that the crisis has been resolved.

"Where an investigation takes place concerning an individual without a personal network, liaises with a Facilitator who will begin the process of developing a response that may include, the development of an alternate plan, a review of the individual's circumstances or unpaid, independent advocacy support.

"Ensures flexible and readily accessible funding is available to address crises"

"Ensures the community's conflict resolution capacity is in place when disagreements that are service related arise…."

"Arranges a local response to provide a conflict resolution process where required and desired."

Unlike the facilitator functions, all of these functions have liability back to CLBC if not performed satisfactorily and an individual is left at risk.
For this reason and because of the types of responsibilities with which the operation analyst is assigned, there is a need for the analyst to have more of a community presence than can be achieved by travel alone.

I also believe that the number of staff allocated to facilitator and operations analyst positions in the model is disproportionately weighed toward the facilitator function. The facilitator function is a completely discretionary service provided to an individual or family. Because there is no decision making in the facilitator role,

even the responsibility for discerning an inadequate plan, goes to the operations analyst. There are only 77 FTE allocated to Operations in total and 205 devoted to Planning and Community Development. **There is the need to re-look at the relative distribution of FTE's between Operation Analysts, Facilitators and Administrative support positions, given all the issues raise.**

Community Living Facilitator

"This position's primary purpose " is to provide information, advice and procedural support to eligible individuals and/or families to enhance their capacity to make and carry out informed decisions in the process of meeting personal needs and to participate in, as well as contribute to, community life". As well the facilitator " carries out community activities, to promote support options for individuals and/or families". The facilitator provides a discretionary function in that individuals/and or families are not required to involve a facilitator in developing their plan. It is envisioned that facilitators will work flexible hours, in their community, as part of a mobile work force. There seems to be sufficient flexibility in the job description and from how respondents see the position functioning, to allow facilitators to respond to the planning role that individuals/and or families request from them. However, there is no authority for decision-making in the role, and plans are approved and resourced under the authority of the operations analyst.

There are some areas, however that need further clarification as to whether the function/ responsibility belongs to the facilitator, operations analyst or is not performed within the Authority. Some issues raised include:

- The respective responsibilities between facilitator and analyst, in conflict resolution and crisis management need to be worked out. Respondents told me this area stills needs operational development.
- Some respondents felt that role of the facilitator in negotiating plans with other Ministries, Health, Education, could be

compromised, if they could not bring assurances of the resources, CLBC would provide. The planning function without some quick decision making capacity might become problematic when trying to bring other players to the table.

- The role of the facilitator with individuals without family or a non- paid support network is unclear. Respondents had different views on exactly how much the facilitator takes on for these individuals.
- For some individuals, planning is almost a daily occurrence. A small numbers of individuals have the profile of a street person. They typically live in a semi independent setting, have alcohol and drug problems, and may be involved in criminal activities. What is the role of the facilitator with these individuals?
- For some families with marginal protection concerns, there is a need for an ongoing CLBC contact person to work on planning with the MCFD social worker.
- Some families, for whatever reason might want or need ongoing support from a facilitator.
- There is a role for the facilitator to work with service providers to individualize services to meet the need. Since facilitators have no real authority in this area, this function could become a problem where contract modifications are needed, unless there is close collaboration with the analyst.

Many of the operational issues raised speak to the question of whether some case management function is needed for some individuals without family or a non-paid support network in place, elderly parents, or for some at risk families of children with developmental disabilities. Respondents differed on their responses to this question. It is an area, which warrants further debate and exploration.

The respective roles of the facilitator and operations analyst needs to be clarified, particularly in the areas or crisis management, conflict resolution, the redesign of contracted services.

Service Delivery Design:

In my opinion, the biggest challenge that the Authority will face is what respondents referred to as "the unbundling of dollars". Approximately 90% of the Authority's total budget is in contracted services, and most of the budget is already committed to individuals presently being served. Respondents talked about the need to move to service principles of Consistency, Equity and Portability of funding, but moving to a more flexible and individualized system, will require the freeing up of dollars from the current system. Some families are quite frightened by this agenda. For agencies, the potential loss of block funding and the movement towards more individualized planning, could mean instability, and have labor and training implications. **For the Authority, as the contracting agency, it will mean that dedicated staff resources will need to manage this agenda if it is to successfully happen over time.**

Director of Accountability and Strategic Management and Innovation and Enterprise Advisor

I did not get from respondents or from the documents, much operational detail on the functions of these two separate organizational units. The job description of the two positions provided most of the detail. From the job descriptions, it appears there is some overlap in functions in research and in influencing the strategic direction of the organization. In addition the Advisor of Innovation and Enterprise manages a Community Innovations Fund to encourage community innovation and development. With this function, the Advisor supports the work of the operations analyst and facilitator. **There is**

a need to define in more operational detail how all these functions relate to each other.

Communications and Issues Management

It was not clear to me from job descriptions or from documents reviewed, where the functions of communications, both internal and external, and issues management were being performed. **These functions are likely in the corporate organizational design, but I thought they were still worth identifying as functions to be given more emphasis.**

Crisis Management, Conflict Resolution and the Safeguards Office

Both the documents and respondents concur that the above functions are very much a work in progress and are still under development. The model's intention is for community to pick up more responsibility in crisis situations and that conflict resolution occur as close to the individual and family as possible. As discussed previously, the responsibility that these functions are adequately performed falls back to Operations. The Authority, as a designated agency under the Adult Guardianship legislation will need to ensure that there is the adequate capacity to respond to allegations of abuse and neglect of vulnerable adults. The model will also need to have built in to it, the capacity to work with Health Authorities responsible for licensing, in local communities. The responsibilities and powers of the Safeguards office are still being worked on. **More work in these areas will ensure that there are proper safeguards in place for individuals and families.**

Mobile Work Force

An underlying assumption of the model is that Facilitators will become a mobile work force in their community, working from their home and car, with supporting technology. This concept not only provides for more flexibility in hours of work, but also encourages outreach to individuals and their families. This concept also allowed for a facilitator to be available in communities that would only warrant a single position. Mobile work force has the advantage of saving on the administrative cost of individual office space. However it has other costs associated with its implementation. As well it has WCB and occupational health and safety issues, which will need to be addressed. This concept while new to Community Living Services, I was told, has been successfully implemented in many organizations.

While facilitators would self manage their time, it would still be necessary to have some scheduled time to cover the need for a facilitator to be available to the public for the hours of operation of the 17 Centers. Some parent respondents told me they did not like the concept of a mobile work force because they did not want to meet with a worker in their homes. They wanted the privacy of an office setting. I was also told that the success of mobile work force is in part, dependent on the having in place the technology to support the worker and a worker's personal suitability for this way of working. It could not likely be imposed on the existing work force, although some workers might voluntarily adapt to it very easily.

Given the above, it might not be possible to have all Facilitators work as a mobile work force in the initial stages of implementation. This could provide some opportunities for the authority to explore other options to achieve flexible hours of work and outreach to individuals and families while still piloting the concept of mobile work force. The Authority might also want look at the relative advantages and disadvantages of providing small communities with a single facilitator position. Respondents agreed that the facilitator function is a relatively easy function to provide under contract with professionals in the community on a retainer basis.

Changing the Culture

Respondents agreed that the CLBC Vision and its service delivery model require a significant paradigm shift and culture change both for Ministry staff and for the community. All acknowledged it is evolutionary and the change will not happen overnight. Some communities will respond quicker than others. Some communities will require more support than others. Until such time that individuals, families and communities can assume more responsibilities, it is important for the Authority to be mindful of its responsibilities to ensure all required functions are covered off. This is a delicate balance between doing too much and doing too little.

When asked what is the strength of the Ministry's current model of service delivery, a quick responses was typically elicited—**it's staff**. Yet, staff I spoke to did not feel part of this change process. It is important for the Authority to use this opportunity of looking at the operational issues, to bring in the knowledge and experience of operational people. **It is important to bring the future staff of the authority into the paradigm shift.**

Like staff, the BCGEU feel left out of the change process and have not had the opportunity to express their concerns to the Interim Authority from their Human Resources and Labor Relations perspective. **It is important that the Interim Authority, the Ministry and the BCGEU have the opportunity dialogue and address these concerns as part of a Labor Relations plan.**

In conclusion, I believe there are operational solutions to each of the above issues. I believe, and most people I talked to believe, the Vision, the separation of planning and decision-making functions and the capacity for community development, can be achieved. I have raised operational issues for the CEO's and Board's consideration. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to assist you in this exciting change process.

Summary of Needs For Further Consideration:

- **A document defining the service delivery model in very operational terms be developed; including Roles, Responsibilities, Reporting Relationships, Linkages, Limitations on Authority.**

- **There needs to be a further exploration of how the model operationalizes the concepts of team and collaboration, including consideration of decentralizing some of the functions performed by the analyst to communities.**

- **There is a need to explore models, which balance the objective of consistency and equity of Operations with the need for collaboration between staff that provide interdependent functions.**

- **There is the need to re-look at the relative distribution of FTE's between Operation Analysts, Facilitators and Administrative support positions, given the issues raised in this paper.**

- **Many of the operational issues raised speak to the question as to whether some case management function is needed for some individuals without family or a non-paid support network in place, elderly parents, or for some at risk families of children with developmental disabilities. Respondents differed on their responses to this question. It is an area, which should receive further debate and exploration.**

- **The respective roles of the facilitator and operations analyst needs to be clarified, particularly in the areas or crisis management, conflict resolution, and the redesign of contracted services.**

- **The service delivery model needs to pay attention to how it will free up dollars to fund the plans that Facilitators will develop with individuals and families. This "unbundling of dollars, or redesign of contracted services" is one of the Authority's biggest challenges, and the model will need to address how the Authority will accomplish this.**

- **There is a need to define in more detail how the functions of Accountability and Strategic Management and Innovation and Enterprise relate to each other and to other functions in the organization, especially in the areas of community development and contracted service redesign.**

- **The functions of communications and issues management may need some further detail as to where and how these functions are performed in the corporate organizational design.**

- **There is a need to complete the work on functions of crisis management, conflict resolution and the Safeguards office, including the interrelationship to other roles and responsibilities in the organization.**

- **The new service delivery model provides an opportunity for the Authority to explore alternatives, including mobile work force, that ensure staff are responsive to individuals and families through flexible hours of work and outreach.**

- **The CLBC service delivery model will require paradigm shift for families, community and staff. There is a need for the Authority to proactively bring staff into the change process.**

- **It is important that the Interim Authority, the Ministry and the BCGEU have the opportunity dialogue and address the Human Resources and Labor Relations issues, in developing a Labor Relations plan.**

Appendix 1

Interview Schedule

Aug.16	Rod Gunn---CLBC Board
Aug.17	Lois Hollstedt-CLBC Board
Aug.19	Brian Berglund-Contract staff
Aug.19	Laird McConvey- CLBC HR staff
Aug.20	Brian Salisbury-Contract staff
Aug.23	Dale Chandler—CLS Manager-Vancouver Island
Aug.24	Dan Collins-Contract staff and ED of Langley Agency
Aug.25	Linda Derkack-Parent, Advocate, Board Family Net
Aug.25	Gus Assonitis -Contract staff
Aug.26	Tim Stainton-Contract staff
Aug.27	Doug Woollard-Acting CEO of CLBC, ED in Delta
Aug.30	Maurice Mourton-CLBC Board
Aug.31	Randi Mjolsness, Robin Syme, Cam Keller, Susan Perkin, James Gorman-MCFD headquarters staff
Sept.1	Roberta Scott— ED -Family Life Homes
Sept.1	Kim Henderson-MCFD headquarters staff
Sept.1	Sue Hill-Contract Staff
Sept.2	Carol Goozh-MCFD CLS Manager
Sept.2	Wayne Doane-MCFD CLS Manager
Sept.2	Anita Dadson (Judy Carter Smith)and other member of Family Net Board
Sept.3	Jane Holland-Advocate for Service Quality
Sept.7	Laine Bryenton, ED BCACL and Cindy Chapman, staff of BCACL
Sept.9	Sreeni Keshara-MCFD CLS Manager
Sept.9	Mary Parkin-MCFD CLS Manage
Sept.10	Laird McConvey –Human Resources staff, CLBC
Sept.10	Gus Assonitis-Contract staff
Sept.13	Lynn Rolko-CLBC Board
Sept.15	Alana Hendren ED of DDA
Sept.16	Jane Cowell-MCFD Regional Executive Director
Sept.16	Linda Perry-ED VELA Board, Chair of Coalition of Families, Agencies and Self-Advocates
Sept. 29	Mike Eso-BCGEU Staff Representative

Appendix 2

Resource Material

Ad Hoc Discussion Paper on Planning Commission and Related Matters Oct27 2003
Accountability Framework between CLBC and MCFD-March 04
A Bylaw to empower Community Level Governance and Innovation
Baseline Readiness Assessment of CLS Devolution-Nov.03
Baseline Readiness Assessment of CLBC Final Report-Dec. 03
Children and Youth with Special Needs –Volumemetrics
Children and Youth with Special Need-Service Delivery Notes
A Charter to Guide Community Living British Columbia in Supporting Individuals of Aboriginal Heritage and the Aboriginal Community-2004
Community Living Planning Commission-Draft Work Plan-2004
Community Living Support Scenarios-2003
Consultations on Community Level Governance-May 2004
Children with Special Needs-MCFD and IA CLBC-June 2004
CLBC Corporate Learning Plan-August 04
Devolution of Services to CL-Updated Assessment of Readiness-Bert Boyd-May 04
Evaluation Mechanism-Janeen McClellan and Associates-Jan.04
Establishing and Managing Waitlists-May 03
Flexible Individual and Family Support Policy
Facilitator Orientation-Salisbury
Health and Safety Standards-Janeen McClellan and Associates-Jan.04
Individual Planning Support Policy and Practice Framework
Internal Audit-Residential Services Program-Persons with a Developmental Disability-Sept.97
Individualized Funding Pilot-Overall Business Process-Discussion Document
Individual and Organizational Development-July 04
Job Descriptions-all positions
Kendrick paper for CLBC Board-2004
Mobile Work force Discussion paper
Managing Three Key Risks in Individualized Funding For Autism Program
Moving towards Devolution-Record of Working Session-Issues and Agreement-Mar.04
Outcomes-Draft-Janeen McClellan and Associates-Jan.04
Orderly Transfer of Responsibility Document
Operational Plan for CLBC and MCFD version 10-June 04
Planning Commission Charter Feb 04
Problem Solving and Dispute Resolution Process in CLBC Dec 03
Readiness Assessment Orientation Information (Binder)
The Role of Community Living Facilitators in British Columbia's System Change Initiative-Brian Salisbury, November 16, 2003
Recommended Changes to Bylaw #3 [A Bylaw to Empower Community Level Governance and Innovation] Based on Preliminary Community Feedback-Salisbury 2004

Role Of Informal Level Community Safeguards-draft 2 April 2004
Safeguards Analysis and Recommendations-Fred Ford-May 2004
Summary Report on Findings-Draft Safeguards and Accountability Framework-Mar.04
Self Reporting Mechanisms-Janeen McClellan and Associates-Jan.04
Stabilization Triage Project
Transition Plan Nov 29, 2003 (Binder)
Training Program for Facilitators-Oct 2003
Workshop Report between IA and South Fraser Community April 04